Based on interviews with a significant cross-section of Agency offices, we have emphasized those major characteristics which are considered universal and have additionally listed those disparate practices worthy of inclusion in a report on Agency promotion policy.

In the DDI and DDS each office has one or more boards or panels who are responsible for decisions on the names and numbers of careerists to be promoted at any one time. The composition of these boards are in the large a group of senior careerists at the staff, directorate or division level and the assignments are not generally rotated. As is obvious from the level of the members, grades are GS-14 and above with a predominance of supergrades. In each of these offices we were assured that the panel members knew the people they were rating. Two prominent offices assign middle-grade careerists as well as higher grade officers to their panels in an apparent attempt to try to assure the panel members know their people who are being rated. In all cases the board deciding promotions also decided other career oriented factors such as reassignments and training.

The Board itself, in conjunction with the Head of the Career Service, decides the criteria by which the careerists will be rated. The same group has the power to make changes when needed.

The factors most often mentioned as basic criteria include:

performance on both current and past jobs, experience, potential,

age, education, time-in-grade, specialized experience or training,

Fitness Reports, recommendations, headroom and assignability.

Ranking exercises are generally separate and distinct from

the promotion exercise. The most common method found was to poll

the board members and have each assign a numerical or adjectival

rating on each individual for each factor being utilized. Another

common method was to have a board member "defend" his nominee

who had been proposed. A minor variation used by one office worked

each careerist within a broadly defined category such as "ready for

promotion now", "doing a good job in present grade," etc.

We could not solicit much opinion regarding the usefulness or

restrictiveness of the CSGA. Everyone recognized it as useful under

our different system and admitted that some restrictions were necessary.

It was considered, of course, to be restrictive when an office couldn't

promote at any given time due to its readings. All offices interviewed

said that they would or have sought exceptions to the CSGA headroom

limitations when necessary.

No one expressed any desire for any centralized promotion

system claiming that it would be too bureaucratic and create more

controls without offering any new benefits. Some felt that perhaps

with regard to clericals some new controls could be introduced.

Personnel officers generally thought the Agency system of promotions (as opposed to the Civil Service System) was good, had worked for some time and provided greater flexibility for assignments. A few claimed that an incumbent in a Civil Service position, on the other hand, knew exactly where he stood.

PERSONAL

~~Personnel~~-rank assignments was another topic discussed. It was felt that they were useful, they should be continued but perhaps they could be monitored better. The recommendation section of this report has some suggestions regarding PRA's. Offices admitted to an "extra effort" being expended as regards the promotion of incumbents with maximum headroom.

Offices normally had two rankings per year, none have as many as three, one office had one annual ranking.

Long range progression is a desired goal in awarding promotions but, frankly, few offices have a firm policy in this area. Offices generally know how far in grade a careerist has potential for but few actually identify intermediate or senior positions, specifically.